



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

THIRTEENTH YEAR—1894—PARTS I. AND II.

On the Text and Interpretation of Amos v. 25-27.

PROF. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

HAMILTON, N. Y.

IT is not likely that either the Massorah or any of the ancient interpreters has preserved the exact words of Amos in this place. A period of more than five centuries lies between the prophet's own time and that of his Alexandrian translator. From these centuries no direct testimony has come down to us. Another period of more than five centuries separates the Alexandrian from Jerome. This epoch has furnished us with a number of witnesses. Unfortunately they do not agree. All extant copies no doubt suffered incidental changes even then. Yet, with one or two exceptions, the important differences in this passage are of such a character as to point to a higher age. The origin of the main variants is difficult to account for historically except in pre-exilian times; and some are most naturally referred to the Assyrian period. It may be safely assumed that these verses had already become a *crux interpretum* in the days of Josiah. The reasons for an early corruption of the text are not far to seek. It is sufficient to mention the difficulty of retaining the prophet's point of view while the conception of Israel's life in the wilderness was gradually changing, the natural expectation of a reference to idolatry at a time when the emphasis on this important theme in prophetic utterances had become particularly marked, the possibility of pronouncing in different ways the same consonantal text, and the necessity of supplying it with explanatory glosses as words became obsolete or from other causes unintelligible. The original text can only be restored conjecturally, and the interpretation given to it must always leave a margin of doubt. But the weight of probability belongs to the view which best harmonizes with the thought of Amos and his age otherwise known to us, and which most naturally accounts for the rise of the variant readings.

I would suggest that the passage originally read as follows :

הַנִּבְחִים וּמִנְחָה הַנְּשָׁתִים-לִי
 כַּמִּדְבָּר אֲרֻבֵּים שָׁנָה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל
 וְנִשְׁאַתֶּם אֶת סִבַּת מַלְכְּכֶם
 וְאֵת כִּיּוֹן אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר נָשִׂיתֶם לָכֶם
 וְהִגַּלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִדֶּלְאָה לְרַמְשֶׁק
 אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צִבְאוֹת שְׁמוֹ

הַ is interrogative. So correctly LXX $\mu\eta$, Trg. הַ, Peš. הַלֵּא, Jerome numquid. Greve, Dahl, and Maurer understood it as the article. Maurer translated : ista sacrificia obtulistis ! and explained : sacrificia debita, lege praescripta. In this case a repetition of the article before מִנְחָה would be expected. For the Pathah with Dageš-forfe cf. Ges.-Kautsch, § 100, 4. A negative answer is expected. This was recognized by the ancient interpreters, and is almost universally acknowledged at the present time. Henderson (*The Minor Prophets*, p. 158) regards the הַ as equivalent to a הַלֵּא, and quotes as evidence of the possibility of such a construction, 1 Sam. ii. 27, 28, Job xx. 4, Jer. xxxi. 20, and Ezek. xx. 4. As to the first passage, Driver warns against "weakening the impassioned question by treating הַ as though it were הַלֵּא" (*Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, p. 28). But Wellhausen had already pointed out that the following Pf. robs the Inf. Abs. of its power to give these words the character of an impassioned question (*Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 48). If the text is correct, the answer that may be expected is uncertain. Did I? Yes or No? But LXX and Trg. seem to have understood the הַ as belonging to the Niphal, if they had it at all. Klostermann (*Samuelis und Könige*, p. 8) reads הַן גִּלְיָה, and this seems to me a most probable conjecture. In the Job passage, Šofar ironically imputes to Job a negative answer. So Dillmann (*Hiob*, p. 182), and that suffices. Siegfried (*The Book of Job*, p. 38) accepts the $\mu\eta$ of LXX and emends, הַלֵּא. The question in Jeremiah is put in a doubtful manner. Yahweh questions himself, astonished to find a tender affection still in his heart for Ephraim. So Giesebrecht (*Jeremia*, p. 169). Here, too, the interrogative is omitted by LXX and Peš. In the last passage, it seems to me very clear that a negative answer is suggested. Yahweh swears that he will give no oracle, and naturally expects of his prophet the same reserve. LXX has no direct question. At most, Henderson's passages belong to the category of questions to which the answer that may be expected

is uncertain, and the attitude of the ancient versions is highly significant. As the force of Amos's question depends entirely upon the definiteness of the answer implied, instances of ׀ dubitative are not in point, and no passage has yet been found where an affirmative answer is clearly expected.

זבחים stands first with emphasis. The prophet does not ask whether Yahweh was worshiped in the desert, but whether sacrifices were offered to him.

מנחה may mean gifts in general, animal or vegetable, the word being used collectively. So LXX *θυσίας*, Peš. קִרְבָּנָא, probably also Jerome sacrificium, though he has the sing. The word is so used in the older sources of the Pentateuch, the earlier historians, the prophets and the Psalms frequently. In the Holiness Code, Ezekiel, the Priestly Writer, Chronicles and elsewhere, it is employed as a technical term for meal-offering. In this sense it also occurs in 2 Kings xvi. 13, 15, which cannot have been written later than in the seventh century. It has been maintained that this usage was limited to the temple at Jerusalem (so even Siegfried-Stade). I can see no good ground for this view. Is it probable that a pious Israelite used a word to designate the vegetable offering accompanying his animal sacrifice at Jerusalem which he hesitated to use concerning the same kind of offering when he worshiped at some other sanctuary? Or was this name kept as a secret by the metropolitan priesthood? In all probability it was as well understood at Bethel as at Jerusalem what a מנחה was when mentioned in connection with an עולה or a זבח. In nice distinctions between sacrifices Bethel was not a whit behind Jerusalem (cf. iv. 4, 5). The sing., whether individual or collective, is most naturally accounted for on the supposition that, in the sacrificial code of Bethel, the מנחה was just such an adjunct to the bloody offerings as the Priestly Writer shows it to have been at Jerusalem.

לִי in its present place does not favor the idea that an antithesis is intended between Yahweh and other gods. In that case the sentence would have begun with הֵלֵל and continued in v. 26 with וַתִּשְׁאוּ, as Smend has pointed out (*Moses apud prophetas*, p. 27). The thought that Israel in the wilderness worshiped other gods than Yahweh meets us only in Ezekiel, and is easily explained by the prophet's peculiar view of Israelitish history. Even with him these strange gods were Egyptian, and not Assyrian, deities. It is not likely that the author of the Holiness Code, in referring to the שִׁירִים worshiped by his contemporaries, Lev. xvii. 7, had in mind at all the

wilderness period, or that the Priestly Writer understood the original meaning of this mock-title. However that may be, the context clearly shows that Amos had no thought of idolatry, but administered his solemn rebuke to all too zealous Yahweh-worshippers.

במדבר וי. The same phrase Num. xxxii. 13. Its occurrence here shows that it was a fixed element of the tradition. It is not very probable that Amos had read the Yahwist. Copies of the work cannot have been very numerous; and the prophet's interest in history can scarcely be adduced as a proof. He was particularly well acquainted with contemporaneous history even outside of Israel, but it is tolerably certain that he did not derive his information from newspaper reports. Neither did he obtain his knowledge of the past from books; he evidently depended upon the same stream of tradition from which the Yahwist drew. If this is so, there seems to be no reason why the statement in Num. xxxii. 13 should not be assigned to this latter historian. That there are genuine Yahwistic elements in vss. 6-15, Dillmann has shown (*Nu.-Jos.*, p. 195), and his assumption of editorial touches here and there appears to me better to account for the peculiarities than Kuenen's theory, which would make the whole a later interpolation (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, xi. 559-562; *Onderzoek*, i. 101).

ארבעים שנה. Duration throughout the period is clearly intended. This is also expressed by LXX τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη and Jerome quadraginta annos. It cannot be denied, of course, that forty years may be used as a round number for thirty-eight years. But the passages quoted by Bredenkamp (*Gesetz und Propheten*, p. 85) are not sufficient to prove this. If Num. xiv. 33, xxxii. 13, and Josh. v. 6 really belong to the Jehovistic chronicles, they are the only passages there referring at all to the length of the wilderness period, and we have no means of knowing whether thirty-eight years are meant rather than forty; if, as Kuenen and Wellhausen think, they were introduced by a later reader or editor, it is equally impossible to speak with certainty of his chronological scheme. Whatever may be the case elsewhere, however, it is altogether improbable that, in this place, the prophet meant to exclude the first two years. If Amos and his contemporaries had looked upon these two years concerning which tradition had most to relate as devoted to the sacrificial cult, while the rest of the sojourn in the wilderness was devoid of it, he would, no doubt, have definitely singled out the latter period, lest some of his hearers should make the simple retort that the fathers did indeed sacrifice in the wilderness for two years, and that pre-

cisely during those years they were more highly favored by Yahweh than afterwards. Unless both the speaker and his audience had been convinced that, during the entire period from the exodus to the invasion of Palestine, Yahweh had graciously led his people, in spite of the fact that sacrifices were not offered to him, the question can have had no force as an appeal to conscience. That such was their conviction may also be inferred from ii. 10, where the whole period is evidently intended.

בית ישראל may refer to the northern tribes addressed by the prophet, or to Israel and Judah together. The mention of Zion in vi. 1, and, above all, the כל משפחה of iii. 1 would seem to favor the second view.

ונשאתם. The waw may be coördinative. So LXX καὶ ἀνελάβετε, Trg. ונמלחון, Jerome et portastis. The Pf. is retained in Peš. אָלָא שְׁקִלְתוֹן, though אָלָא, like the בָּל of the Arabic version, expresses the adversative sense "but," "nay rather," "on the contrary." So also, in modern times, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Gesenius, Vatke, Hengstenberg, Hitzig, Keil, Merx, Kuenen, Bredenkamp, Reuss, Tiele, Steiner, Henderson, Cook. Theodore of Mopsuestia (ed. Wegern, p. 221 ff.) thought of the immediate past leading up to the present; so also Baudissin, Herzog (art. "Saturn"), et alii.¹ Oort (*De dienst der Baalim*) and G. Hoffmann (*Z.A.T.W.*, 1883) translate: "while at the same time ye carried." This is a free translation, but does not introduce any foreign elements into the text, as Bredenkamp avers (l.c.). The real difficulty with the view of these scholars is that it breaks the force of the expected negative answer to the question of v. 25. Theirs is otherwise the merit of having paved the way for a better understanding of this passage by recognizing that vss. 25 and 26 together describe religious exercises of the prophet's own time, which, according to his conception, were not performed by their fathers in the wilderness. — Or the waw may be regarded as consecutive. So, following Rashi, Ewald, Schrader, Baethgen, Smend, Farrar, Volck. Kautzsch and Driver hesitate, but incline to the same view. Smend, indeed, feels troubled by the absence of a וְהָיָה or a הִנֵּה invariably used elsewhere when, without a very manifest transition in thought, the Pf. is intended to have the force of a future. But Volck has found two analogous cases which deserve attention (*Utshe-nuja Sapiski*, 1893, No. 1). These are Isa. vi. 7 and Hos. viii. 14.

¹ In his last book, *Godsdienst in de Oudheid*, p. 315, Tiele prefers to think of the present.

Dillmann is no doubt right that, in the first passage, the waw in **וּכְרַ** is consecutive, and that **תִּכְפֹּר** is in the Impf. because of its separation from the waw (l.c. p. 59). But while the condition described by the last two verbs is subsequent to the touching of the prophet's lips, the act of forgiveness is coincident with it and prior to the announcement of the fact. Hence most translators from Umbreit to Guthe and Duhm use the present tense. Even a past tense might be used without violence to any principle of the language: "this touched thy lips, and thy sin passed away." Cheyne's rendering is perhaps the best: "forthwith thy sin is gone." The close connection of thought is well brought out in Duhm's interpretation (*Das Buch Jesaia*, p. 46 ff.). The passage certainly is useless for Volck's purpose. Its sense would be destroyed by the introduction of a **וַיְהִי**, so natural in the proposed construction, and by the consequent translation: "Behold this touched thy lips, and it shall come to pass that thy sin will pass away." Wellhausen is unquestionably correct in recognizing in Hos. viii. 14 a later gloss. It is difficult for me to believe that the whole verse came from one hand. 14b is borrowed from Amos i. 4, 7, 10, 12, ii. 2, 5; is loosely connected with what precedes; and may well have been added by a separate hand, its present form being due to the reminiscence. Was there, perchance, something in the pronunciation of **וּשְׁלַחְתִּי** indicating that, in spite of the form and independent of the connection, it was an Impf. and not a Pf.? The hypothesis of Lambert (*Revue des études juives*, xxvi. 47 ff.) deserves serious attention. The same query applies to Gen. xx. 11, xxvi. 22, and Jud. xiii. 3, quoted by Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 112, 4a. This, of course, introduces a similar doubt in the passage before us; and it must be admitted that the absence of a **וַיְהִי** or a **הָנָה** does not preclude the possibility of a waw consecutive here. Nevertheless Tiele's words are scarcely too strong: "De opvatting der perfecta als toekomstig heeft op zichzelf iets gewelddadigs en geeft als tegenstelling geen zin" (*Godsdienst*, p. 315). This is so clearly seen by Wellhausen that he feels obliged to omit the whole verse except the waw, which he is then free to make consecutive. That is cutting the knot with the sword. And why not? If there were no possible interpretation besides those already propounded, the example would be tempting. Only I would omit the waw as well, or at least confess my ignorance as to its character; and I should feel it incumbent on me to explain how the verse could be inserted here, when the insertion was made, and what the interpolator meant.

My own view is that the waw is coördinative; that the verb conse-

quently refers to the past; and that the verse is to be regarded as a continuation of v. 25, without a repetition of the ה, or the insertion of an א. For examples of this construction, cf. Job xiii. 7:

הלאל תדברו שוֹלָה
ולו תדברו רמיה

Will ye speak what is false for God?
Will ye speak what is a lie in his behalf?

Job xv. 7:

הראשון אדם תולד
ולפני גבעות חוללת

Wast thou born as the first of men?
Wast thou brought forth before the hills?

Job xv. 8:

הבסוד אלוה תשמע
ותנרע אליך חכמה

Didst thou listen in the council of God?
Didst thou draw to thyself wisdom?

Job xxxviii. 16:

הבאת ער נבכי ים
ובחקר תהום התהלכת

Didst thou make thy way to the sources of the sea?
Didst thou take thy walk at the confines of the ocean?

Job xxxviii. 32:

התציא מזרות בעתו
ועיש על בניה תנחם²

Canst thou bring forth the Hyades in their season?
Canst thou comfort the bear for her children?

Job xl. 26:

התשים אנמן באפו
ובחורו תקב לחיו

Wilt thou put a rope through his nose?
Wilt thou bore through his jaw with a hook?

In the same way I would translate:

הזבחים ומנחה הנשתם לי וג'
ונשאחם את סכת מלככם וג'

Did ye bring me sacrifices and meal-offerings . . .?
Did ye carry the tabernacle of your king . . .?

² So Michaelis, Merx, Hitzig, Siegfried.

It is well known that in a second question the **אם** or **וא** in Arabic is frequently omitted, the tone and the connection indicating its interrogative character (cf. Caspari, *Arabische Grammatik*, § 548). Even in Ethiopic the enclitic **ከ** may, indeed, be repeated when the question consists of more than one sentence, but is not necessarily, though a question without interrogative particle is rare in that language (Dillmann, *Aethiopische Grammatik*, § 198). After such interrogative adverbs as **למה** and **מדוע** in Hebrew, the same construction occurs. The omission of a second **ו** after a waw conjunctive in indirect questions in Syriac also gives evidence of this tendency (Duval, *Traité du grammaire syriaque*, § 383).

As to the meaning of **נשא**, it is often used to denote the carrying in solemn procession of a sacred object, not only an idol, as Isa. xlv. 20 et al., but also the chest of Yahweh, Ex. xxv. 14 et al.; the ephod, 1 Sam. ii. 28; the holy vessels, Isa. lii. 11. Wellhausen justly remarks that vanquished gods are generally carried away by the conquerors themselves as trophies, and are not left by them in the hands of their captives to carry (*Skizzen*, v. 83). Particularly would this be true if Assyrian gods were meant. What in such a case the Assyrians would have done may be judged, if not from the manner in which Agukakrime and Aššurbanipal brought the images of Marduk, Zarpanitu, and Nana back to their temples (for these had once been violently removed), at least from the way in which Meša' carried the vessels of Yahweh from Nebo, and the altar of the Dod³ of Ataroth to Kerieth, and the emphasis he puts upon his own part in this glorious deed (*Inscription*, lines 12, 17, 18).

סִבְתָּ. So LXX *τὴν σκηνήν* (cf. Acts vii. 43), Peš. **מִשְׁכָּנָא**, Sym. *τὴν σκηνήν*, Jerome tabernaculum. Aq. has *τοὺς συνσκησμούς* = tabernacula. Paul de Lagarde gives **סִבְתָּ** as the true reading of the Trg. (*Prophetæ chaldaice*, p. 452). Hence the reading **סִבְתָּ** is probably to be pronounced like M., and not **סִבְתָּ** as Aq. The **סִבְתָּ** of M. represents, in my opinion, an early change in the pronunciation of the word, which, of course, was written without any *mater lectionis*. Theodotion's *ῥασον* is probably due to a confusion with **שִׁכָּה**.

מֶלֶךְכֶּם. So M., Theodotion and Sym. *τοῦ βασιλέως ὑμῶν*, Jerome moloch vestro. Melek undoubtedly was one of the appellations of Yahweh. (Cf. 1 Sam. xiv. 49, xxxi. 2; Isa. vi. 5; Ps. xxiv. 1 ff.,

³ **דדה** obscuration of **דָּדָה** = **דָּדָה** (דָּדָה)? Winckler (*Altorientalische Forschungen*, ii. 195) suggests that **דָּ** is a suffix and that **דָּד** is the genius loci. Was there a Hadad of Ataroth? Hadad appears as Dad in Bir-dadda, Dad-idri, Bil-dad (cf. Schrader, *Z.K.F.* ii. 365 ff.).

xlvi. 3; Stade, *Geschichte*, i. 609 ff.; Baethgen, *Semitische Religionsgeschichte*, p. 146; Smend, *Religionsgeschichte*, p. 51). Wellhausen is quite right in maintaining that the prophet cannot, in this connection, have accused the Israelites of idolatry either in the wilderness or at his own time (*Skizzen*, v. 83). He is speaking of excessive Yahweh-worship. Peš. מִלְכִּים and Aq. Μολχομ represent a later view according to which the Ammonite מלכִּם is meant. Probably at all times, but particularly in the reign of Manasseh, the worship of Yahweh as Melek had a tendency to fall to the level of the cruel Milkom-cult of the Ammonites. It is, therefore, only natural that this appellative should have been avoided by the stricter Yahweh-worshippers, and that, in course of time, Melek should have been understood as referring to another deity than Yahweh. Trito-Isaiah evidently uses it of the Ammonite god, lvii. 9 (cf. Duhm, l.c. 401). This accounts both for the retention and the dropping of the second Kaph. The LXX Μολοχ (cf. Acts vii. 43), and Jerome Moloch correspond to מִלְךְ, the Bošeth pronunciation of Melek (cf. Stade, l.c.). This understanding of the word found no use for the suffix.

כִּיֹּן. So M., Trg., Aq. and Sym. χιὼν, Jerome imaginem. The root seems to be כֹּן, and the meaning "stand," "pillar," "statue," "image." An image of Yahweh is probably meant. Peš. כִּיֹּן represents, in my judgment, a later pronunciation of the consonants, occasioned by a misconception of the passage, and possibly facilitated by the obsolescence of the ancient word with the cessation of the custom. The idea that a foreign deity was mentioned in vs. 26a would naturally lead to an expectation of finding others. The worship of the Assyro-Babylonian Kaimanu or Kaivanu (II. R. 32, 25, cf. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 111 ff.) may have been introduced into Israel at the close of the eighth century by Assyrian soldiers or by the deported Cuthaeans. Or this name of the planet Saturn may have drifted into Palestine from the same source centuries earlier, when there were close relations between Babylonia and Palestine. We know from the Amarna correspondence and the Egyptian literature that many deities of Babylonian origin were worshiped in Palestine before the Hebrew invasion. That their worship continued is quite probable. Our lack of definite knowledge in this respect is largely due to the habit of Biblical writers of referring to various gods simply as Ba'alim. Equally unfortunate is our ignorance concerning the age of the name Kewan in Mesopotamia. That Kewan was identified with Saturn in Edessa, is seen from Ephrem, ii. 458. But had there been a Kewan cult in Edessa before this city became Christian? And, if so, did it antedate

the Assyrian supremacy over Mesopotamia? The Mandaeans used the name (e.g. Genza, i., right, p. 27, ed. Petermann), written כיואן. Had they obtained it from the heathen Syrians, the Babylonians, or the Persians? There is no positive evidence that even the name of Kewan was known either in Palestine or in Mesopotamia until the second Christian century. Peš. is our first witness; and it may have been nothing but the common identification of Malkum with Saturn that led the Syrian to pronounce כיון, Kewan. Yet we know that the worship of Adar-Malik, or Saturn, as Melek, was introduced in Samaria through people deported thither by Sargon II. from Sipar (2 Kings xvii. 31), and it is therefore natural to suppose that the identification of another name of Adar, Kewan, with Melek may have suggested itself to some reader already in the Assyrian period. The pronunciation Kewan probably caused the transformation of סַכַּת into סַכּוּת, the Palestinian equivalent for Sakkut, another name of Adar-Saturn (II. R. 57, 40), the *a* changing into an *i*, as in Rammān-Rimmon, Tukulti-apāl-e-šarra — Tiglath Pileser. There is, of course, the possibility of סַכּוּת having been an earlier pronunciation of סַכַּת meaning tabernacle, but of this there is no evidence. The LXX Παῖφαν may be due to a copyist's error, פ and כ being easily confounded. Kircher (*Prodromus*, 1636, p. 147; *Lex.*, 1644, p. 49, 527^o) found in a Coptic-Arabic glossary, and in a commentary on Acts, PHΦAN explained by the Arab. [رحل] رنل, 'Saturn.' This explanation, in its time widely accepted, is defended by J. D. Michaelis (*Supplementa*, p. 1225 ff.). P. E. Jablonski (*Remphah Aegyptiorum deus*, 1731 = *Opuscula*, ed. Te Water, 1806, ii. p. 41 ff.), rejecting the evidence of the glossaries, as merely derived from the Bible, adopted from the Complutensian in Amos, and from [Hoeschel's] Origen, the reading Ρομφα, which he explained as Egyptian, *Ro-mphah*, 'King of heaven,' i.e. the sun.

כוכב is, as Wellhausen recognizes (l.c. p. 82), an explanatory gloss to Kewan which it precedes in the LXX. The fact that it occurs in all the versions shows that it must have crept in early, and also that the pronunciation Kewan, which it was intended to explain, was of old standing. Its position in the LXX shows that it was entered from the margin in different places. There is no evidence of the use of כוכב anywhere as the proper name of a deity, as Grätz conjectures (*Emendationes*, p. 17).

צלמיכ, LXX τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν, Trg. צלמיכון, Jerome idolorum vestrorum, I also regard, with Wellhausen, l.c., as a gloss to אלהיכם. It was probably occasioned by the phrase אשר עשיתם לכם. There

is no ground that I can see for identifying Kewan with the Aramaean god צלם, or for finding a reference to that deity here, as Baethgen does (*Semitische Religionsgeschichte*, p. 239). In Theodotion, the probable reading is εἰδῶλων, and not εἰδωλον, and even if he found simply צלם in his copy, his ἀμαύρωσιν does not render it likely that he had the slightest thought of Kewan.

אלהיכם I think referred to Yahweh, Israel's god.

אשר עשיתם originally referred to כַּכָּת and כִּיִּין, if I am correct.

והגלתי. Waw consecutive. So LXX καὶ μετακινῶ, Jerome et migrare vos faciam, and all modern interpreters.

מהלאה לדמשק. Assyria is meant. The three Syrian campaigns of Aššur-dan III. [773-755] in 773, 772, and 755 (Tiele, *Bab.-Ass. Geschichte*, p. 208), may have been more successful than is generally assumed (Winckler, *Geschichte Ass. u. Bab.*, p. 206); and may have led Amos, who need not have known the internal weakness of Aššur-dan's reign, to expect the judgment to come from this direction (cf. Wildeboer, *Letterkunde*, p. 108). Whether he can be supposed to have known of Aššurnāṣirpal's [885-860] expedition against Aḥarri, as König suggests (*Einleitung*, p. 305), seems to me more doubtful, though he may have heard of that of Rammannirari III. [811-783]. The ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος of Acts vii. 43 may be a wrong explanation on the part of Stephen, or of the author of Acts, or in the copy of the LXX used by either.

Beginning with v. 21 I translate:

I hate, I despise your feasts;
 I cannot endure the smell of your feast-days.
 For if ye bring me burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, I care not for them;
 And I will not look at the peace-offerings of your fat bullocks.
 Away from me with the noise of your songs!
 I will not listen to the music of your cithers.
 Let judgment pour forth like water,
 Justice like a perennial stream!
 Did ye bring me sacrifices and meal-offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house
 of Israel?
 Did ye then carry about the tabernacle of your king, the image of your god which
 ye have made for yourselves?
 Nay, I must send you in exile beyond Damascus,
 Saith Yahweh, God of Hosts is his name.

The day of Yahweh will be a day of terror, and no religious observances can avert the coming judgment. It is of no avail to gather at the sanctuaries, to bring precious holocausts and offerings of every kind, to provide choice music at the sacrificial banquets,

and to carry in procession the sacred symbols of Yahweh's presence. He who faithfully led Israel through the wilderness, and graciously gave it the land of the Amorites (ii. 10, iii. 1, ix. 7), though no sacrifices were offered to him in all that time and no tabernacles or statues were carried about in his honor, will not be induced by such performances now to abstain from his purpose; he will pour forth his judgment like a stream, and send upon Israel the armies of Assyria which will carry the people into exile.

This is the prophet's warning. That **משפט** and **צדקה** in v. 24 do not refer to subjective righteousness, but to divine judgment, has been recognized by Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Kimchi, Keil, Bredenkamp, Hitzig, König, et al. Volck's objection (l.c.), that, if the Israelites obey the commandment to take away the noise of their songs, there is no reason why they should be carried away with a flood of divine judgment, is not to the point. For the prophet cherishes no expectation that his hearers will abandon their ritualism, as v. 27 clearly shows. He does demand righteousness of them elsewhere, but in this connection he is intent upon impressing the truth, that "the day of Yahweh will be darkness and not light," in spite of ceremonies which they ought to know that Yahweh has not commanded. Verse 24 has the same ominous sound as v. 27.

That Amos looked upon the wilderness period as being without any sacrificial cult, v. 25 alone, where the text has remained incorrupt, shows with sufficient clearness. V. 26, in my judgment, only adds another feature to the picture of the Yahweh-worship practised by the prophet's contemporaries, which, according to him, was equally unknown in the Mosaic period. Canon Cook's explanation: "they did indeed sacrifice, but could they be acceptable?" does not explain but flatly contradicts the words of Amos. The prophet affirms that they did not sacrifice, and uses this as a proof that Yahweh does not want sacrifices. Hoffmann's construction of the passage also implies that sacrifices were offered to Yahweh, but not to other gods. Volck (l.c.) rightly objects that the prophet cannot have meant to indicate the sojourn in the desert as the time when the Yahweh-cult particularly flourished. But the passages he quotes as sustaining his objection are not well chosen. In Dt. ix. 7 the context shows that the sins provoking Yahweh's anger were just such worship of Yahweh-images and such moral delinquencies as, in Amos's time, went hand in hand with a flourishing sacrificial cult; in Lev. xvii. 7 (H) the mention of sacrifices to the **שעירים** does not prove that sacrifices were not brought to Yahweh, for such must be the

offerings referred to in the preceding verses; Num. xxv. 16, 2, 4 (J) proves, if anything, that it was contact with the Palestinian nations that first awakened a desire in Israel for participation in splendid sacrificial banquets; and Ezek. xx. 18-26 speaks not only of the worship of Egyptian gods by the younger as well as the older generation in the wilderness, but also of the sacrifice of children to Yahweh at his own command. Besides, the value of all such groupings of passages as proof-texts is vitiated by the fact that they represent the views of different men living at different times. With more relevancy, Volck might have pointed out that the admission on the part of Amos that the wilderness period was characterized by a zealous Yahweh cult would have completely demolished the force of his appeal. Volck himself explains: "Did ye offer ample and magnificent sacrifices in the wilderness, trusting in their power to conciliate my anger? Insignificant was the sacrificial apparatus then, and yet I was propitiated." If Amos had meant to say this, he could have expressed it without difficulty. But the context shows that Amos does not advocate either a moderation in the number and costliness of sacrifices or a sacrificing without the hope of propitiating the deity. What he wants is total abstinence; not less, but none.

It is not necessary to suppose, as Baethgen does (*Religionsgeschichte*, p. 181), that there is an irreconcilable discrepancy between the views of Amos and the Yahwist. Different, no doubt, their opinions were. But Amos may have believed as firmly as the historian that "sacrifices are as old as the world." For aught we know he may have believed that the ancestors in pre-Mosaic times had sacrificed at this very shrine where he preached against sacrifices. What he contended for was, that no sacrifices were brought to Yahweh in the wilderness, and that he nevertheless was gracious to his people. A very simple consideration may have led to this opinion. Where would the people get animals for sacrifices when the flocks were not sufficient for their own needs? Where would meal-offerings come from when there was no agriculture? These questions do not, indeed, settle the matter historically, as Volck seems to think (l.c.), but they may have influenced the thinking of Amos's day. The Yahwist tells of no sacrifices in the wilderness. And if the Elohist knows of sacrifices offered at the conclusion of the covenant (Ex. xxiv. 3-8), he has taken care to account for the presence of the needed animals (Ex. x. 25, 26; xii. 32). Only the use to which Amos put a quite generally recognized fact was original. He saw in

it, as already Theodore of Mopsuestia clearly understood, not an accident, but a significant providence indicating Yahweh's willingness to lead his people without being induced to do so by sacrifices, and his displeasure at the whole sacrificial cult. And he had the same conviction regarding tabernacles and images. In his own day images of Yahweh seem to have been carried about in tabernacles, even as the images of other deities were (Hos. ix. 6). Possibly the close connection of these ceremonies with the temple service determined his thought. There was no temple in the wilderness, and therefore, it may have appeared to him, in all probability no processions of this kind any more than sacrifices.

That Amos was not alone in his estimate of the wilderness period as a time when Yahweh was pleased with his people, Dt. viii. shows; and that other prophets regarded that period as devoid of sacrifices appears from Jeremiah's words: "I did not speak with your fathers nor did I command them at the time when I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices," vii. 22.

These facts cannot be changed by the circumstance that in priestly circles a different conception of the Mosaic period became gradually dominant. It is scarcely pertinent to quote as Bredenkamp does (l.c. p. 85), Num. xv., where the **מנחה** is not contemplated until the settlement in Palestine, for an anachronism in regard to this offering would be somewhat too glaring, and Num. xxviii., from which it is not even safe to infer that the writer thought of a cessation of the Tamid after Israel had left Sinai. Ex. xxix., Lev. ix. 1-24, Num. vii., ix., not to mention other passages, speak too eloquently of the author's faith both in divine commands concerning the sacrifices and in a most magnificent sacrificial cult in the wilderness, to allow of any doubt. And the gorgeous description of the tabernacle (Ex. xxv., xxvi., xl.), which according to the Priestly Writer was carried about in the wilderness, leaves no room for a reconciliation of his view with that of Amos.

The historic truth probably lies somewhere between these extremes. The tribes which in the second half of the thirteenth century, under the leadership of Moses, moved with their herds from place to place on the Sinaitic peninsula, no doubt, like other nomads, offered their sacrifices and had their sacred symbols. They may well have had an ark and a tabernacle, like the *σκηνή ἱερὰ* of the Carthaginians that Diodorus Siculus speaks of (xx. 65), or the *parakku* of the Babylonians (cf. Tiele, *Godsdienst in de Oudheid*, p. 187), and some such image of Yahweh as that of which Ex. xxxii. preserves a reminis-

cence. But this should unquestionably be granted to Amos, that such a feasting, and sacrificing, and parading as the Israelites of his time indulged in at the ancient shrine of Bethel were not the order of the day in the wilderness, but had been introduced into the Yahweh-cult upon the assumption by the invaders of the old Amorite sanctuaries; nor is it likely that the young nation in the desert had any such elaborate and gorgeous ritual as the Priestly Writer, idealizing the past, imagined. But the Israel of that great epoch did have a strong sense of Yahweh's love and of his gracious presence preparing these sons of the desert to enter into possession of the goodly land that had long been to them a land of promise. This was of permanent religious significance. For whatever value the sacrificial cult may have had, — and the philosopher of religion will not be inclined to underestimate it, — it was the sense of Yahweh's faithfulness and the emphasis on justice and mercy that made Amos and his true successors among the prophets forerunners of him whose thoughts, rightly understood, and whose spirit, rightly appropriated, put an end forever to all formalism in religion.